

Application No. 10/725,682
Attorney Docket No. NUKZ 2 00446
Response to Office Action dated October 17, 2005

Page 5 of 6

REMARKS

Applicant has now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of October 17, 2005.

Claims 14 and 15 were allowed, which is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 2-5, 8, 9 and 11-13 contained allowable subject matter but were objected as depending from rejected parent claims. The indication of allowable subject matter is noted and appreciated.

In this response, Applicant amended independent claims 1 and 10 and presents clarifying remarks believed to remedy the Examiner's rejections and place the claims in condition for allowance.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested

I. Drawings

The drawing was objected to in that element "40" of Figure 1 was not connected to the system to perform its function. Applicant submits herewith a replacement drawing as required by the Examiner. No new matter is added by the replacement drawing (which maintains the numeral 40 referenced in the application in paragraph 16 and removes the "unconnected" box).

II. Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,240,082 to Yu.

Claims 1, 6-7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 60024954 to Arakawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,007,193 to Kashimura et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,975,689 to Pawlowski.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations of dependent claim 9. It is therefore respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 and claims 2-8 dependent therefrom distinguish patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

Applicant has amended independent claim 10 to include the limitations of dependent claim 12. It is therefore respectfully submitted that amended claim 10 and claims 11 and 13 dependent therefrom distinguish patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

Application No. 10/725,682
Attorney Docket No. NUKZ 2 00446
Response to Office Action dated October 17, 2005

Page 6 of 6

CONCLUSION

All formal and informal matters have been addressed. For the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 13-15 are in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this Amendment. If, however, a fee is due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge our Deposit Account No. 06-0308.

In the event the Examiner believes a telephone call would expedite prosecution, he is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

**FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP**

Date: 17 January 2006

Timothy E. Nauman
Timothy E. Nauman
Reg. No. 32,283
1100 Superior Avenue - 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582 (phone)
(216) 241-1666 (facsimile)

N:\NUKZ\200446\res0000246V001.doc